
The “officially released” date that appears near the beginning of each opinion is the date the opinion will be published in the Connecticut Law Journal or the date it was released as a slip opinion. The operative date for the beginning of all time periods for filing postopinion motions and petitions for certification is the “officially released” date appearing in the opinion. In no event will any such motions be accepted before the “officially released” date.

All opinions are subject to modification and technical correction prior to official publication in the Connecticut Reports and Connecticut Appellate Reports. In the event of discrepancies between the electronic version of an opinion and the print version appearing in the Connecticut Law Journal and subsequently in the Connecticut Reports or Connecticut Appellate Reports, the latest print version is to be considered authoritative.

The syllabus and procedural history accompanying the opinion as it appears on the Commission on Official Legal Publications Electronic Bulletin Board Service and in the Connecticut Law Journal and bound volumes of official reports are copyrighted by the Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut, and may not be reproduced and distributed without the express written permission of the Commission on Official Legal Publications, Judicial Branch, State of Connecticut.

PETER LARSON v. MATILDA LARSON
(AC 24313)

Lavery, C. J., and Schaller and Dranginis, Js.

Argued February 8—officially released March 8, 2005

Plaintiff's appeal from the Superior Court in the judicial district of Stamford-Norwalk, *Hon. Dennis F. Harrigan*, judge trial referee.

Per Curiam. The judgment is affirmed.

JEFFREY R. PERRY v. COMMISSIONER OF
CORRECTION (AC 25235)

Dranginis, Harper and Hennessy, Js.

Argued February 7—officially released March 8, 2005

Petitioner's appeal from the Superior Court in the judicial district of Tolland, *White, J.*

PER CURIAM. The habeas court dismissed the petition for a writ of habeas corpus that was filed by the petitioner, Jeffrey R. Perry, and then denied his petition for certification to appeal from that dismissal. After careful review of the record and briefs, we conclude that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the issues are debatable among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner or that the questions raised deserve encouragement to proceed further. See *Lozada v. Deeds*, 498 U.S. 430, 431-32, 111 S. Ct. 860, 112 L. Ed. 2d 956 (1991); *Simms v. Warden*, 230 Conn. 608, 616, 646 A.2d 126 (1994).

The appeal is dismissed.

MERITA MUCA v. SYLVIONES GEFFRARD ET AL.
(AC 25655)

McLachlan, Harper and West, Js.

Argued February 14—officially released March 8, 2005

Defendants' appeal from the Superior Court in the judicial district of Hartford, *Shapiro, J.*

Per Curiam. The judgment is affirmed.
